

1 James F. Basile (SBN 228965)  
james.basile@kirkland.com  
2 Elizabeth L. Deeley (SBN 230798)  
elizabeth.deeley@kirkland.com  
3 Adam L. Gray (SBN 262557)  
adam.gray@kirkland.com  
4 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
555 California Street  
5 San Francisco, California 94104  
Telephone: (415) 439-1400  
6 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

7 Susan Marie Davies (*Admitted pro hac vice*)  
susan.davies@kirkland.com  
8 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.  
9 Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 879-5000  
10 Facsimile: (202) 879-5200

11 Attorneys for Defendant  
12 FACEBOOK, INC.

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15  
16 SAMBREEL HOLDINGS LLC; YONTOO LLC;  
and THEME YOUR WORLD LLC,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 vs.

19 FACEBOOK, INC.,

20 Defendant.  
21

CASE NO. 12-CV-00668-CAB-KSC

**DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
UNOPPOSED EX PARTE  
APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
DECLARATIONS IN RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION**

Judge: Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo  
Hearing Date: August 9, 2012  
Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 2

1 Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”) seeks leave to file two supplemental declarations in response to  
2 the new material Sambreel presented for the first time in its Reply in Support of Motion for  
3 Preliminary Injunction (“Reply”). The Court should grant the relief because Facebook would be  
4 unfairly prejudiced without an opportunity to address these new assertions. Plaintiffs do not object  
5 to Facebook submitting the supplemental declarations, and do not object to the Court’s consideration  
6 of those declarations. Decl. of Elizabeth L. Deeley ¶ 4.

7 Sambreel filed a motion for a preliminary injunction on March 19, 2012 (Doc. No. 3-1)  
8 (“Mot.”). Pursuant to this Court’s order (Doc. No. 37), Facebook filed a timely Opposition on July  
9 13, 2012. Doc. No. 41. Sambreel filed its Reply (Doc. No. 45) on July 27, 2012. With its Reply,  
10 Sambreel filed a Declaration of Matthew Adams in Support of Reply on Preliminary Injunction  
11 (Doc. No. 45-4) (“Adams Declaration” or “Adams Decl.”). The Adams Declaration contains a  
12 number of previously undisclosed assertions. Because Sambreel introduced these assertions for the  
13 first time in a declaration accompanying its Reply, Facebook was unaware of them, and was unable  
14 to address them in its Opposition.

15 For example, the Adams Declaration discusses a product called “PageCraze.” *See* Adams  
16 Decl. ¶¶ 3-15. He describes PageCraze as a “Facebook Application that operates on the Facebook  
17 Platform.” *Id.* ¶ 3. Sambreel asserts that PageCraze “operates in a fashion that is nearly  
18 indistinguishable from Facebook’s description of PageRage—except that it does not show  
19 advertising to its users” (Reply at 6:10-11), and suggests that Facebook nevertheless permits  
20 PageCraze to continue operating. *See id.* Facebook seeks to respond to Sambreel’s new assertions  
21 with the Second Declaration of Jud Hoffman in Support of Defendant’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’  
22 Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, attached hereto as Ex. 1.

23 The Adams Declaration also purports to provide an “analysis” of a Facebook toolbar.  
24 Sambreel asserts that the toolbar “modifies a user’s web browsing experience” by obscuring or  
25 pushing website content from the visible area of the browser window, and describes its behavior as  
26 somehow comparable to Sambreel’s PageRage product. Adams Decl. ¶¶ 16-23; *see also* Reply at 5-  
27 6. Facebook seeks to respond to these new assertions with the Supplemental Declaration of James E.  
28

Hung in Support of Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction, attached hereto as Ex. 2.

It would be unfair and unduly prejudicial for the Court to consider Sambreel's new purported evidence on Reply<sup>1</sup> without giving Facebook the opportunity to rebut these new materials. "[T]he district court should not consider the new evidence without giving the non-movant an opportunity to respond." *Provenz v. Miller*, 102 F.3d 1478, 1483 (9th Cir. 1996) (citation and alteration omitted); *Pacquiao v. Mayweather*, No. 2:09-cv-2448-LRH-RJJ, 2010 WL 3271961, at \*1 (D. Nev. Aug. 13, 2010) ("[T]he court cannot consider new evidence provided in a reply when the other party does not have an opportunity to respond to the evidence.") (citing *Provenz*, 102 F.3d at 1483); *see also, e.g., Iconix, Inc. v. Tokuda*, 457 F. Supp. 2d 969, 975-76 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (citing *Provenz* and permitting defendants to file supplemental declarations in response to new evidence introduced in plaintiffs' preliminary injunction Reply). The *ex parte* relief Facebook seeks should therefore be granted.

### CONCLUSION

Sambreel submitted new material with its Reply, depriving Facebook of an opportunity to respond to Sambreel's assertions. Facebook should be permitted to respond, and respectfully requests that the Court grant it leave to file the attached declarations in response to Sambreel's motion for a preliminary injunction.

DATED: August 6, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

/s/ Elizabeth L. Deeley

Elizabeth L. Deeley  
elizabeth.deeley@kirkland.com

James F. Basile  
james.basile@kirkland.com

Adam L. Gray  
adam.gray@kirkland.com

Susan Marie Davies (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
susan.davies@kirkland.com

<sup>1</sup> In moving for a preliminary injunction, Sambreel was required to "***serve[] and file[] with the notice of motion . . . all documentary evidence*** which [Sambreel] intends to submit in support" of its motion. *See* Civil Local Rule 7.1(f)(2)(a) (emphasis added). A "district court need not consider arguments raised for the first time in a reply brief." *Zamani v. Carnes*, 491 F.3d 990, 997 (9th Cir. 2007).

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 6, 2012 I electronically filed the foregoing **DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF UNOPPOSED EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DECLARATIONS IN RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION** with the Clerk of the court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses registered, as denoted on the Court's Electronic Mail Notice List and will be sent by overnight mail delivery to the following:

Daniel Kotchen  
KOTCHEN & LOW LLP  
2300 M Street NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20037

DATED: August 6, 2012

By: /s/ Elizabeth L. Deeley  
Elizabeth L. Deeley